



## 7. COORDINATION OF LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING

### 7.1 Local Funding and Technical Assistance

**Requirement:** §201.4(c)(4)(i): [The section on the Coordination of Local Mitigation Planning must include a] description of the State process to support, through funding and technical assistance, the development of local mitigation plans.

#### Local Planning Funding & Technical Assistance

The Arizona Division of Emergency Management has been extremely proactive in assisting our counties, local jurisdictions and tribal governments in the development of hazard mitigation plans. Shortly after the DMA 2K guidance was released, FEMA allocated PDM funds to the states. At that time, PDM was not competitive. ADEM received \$371,371 and an implementation strategy was developed to assist local jurisdictions with meeting the DMA 2K criteria. As part of the implementation strategy, a portion of the \$371,371 was used to develop a Model Plan which could be used as a tool by local jurisdictions in the hazard mitigation planning process.

Then in 2003, ADEM applied for a PDM planning grant and was awarded \$248,375. The award was enough to assist four counties and their incorporated communities. At that point, ADEM developed criteria for selecting the four initial counties. A notice went out to all counties letting them know that money was becoming available for mitigation planning. Interested counties needed to submit an application by the due date if they were willing and able to meet the following selection criteria: (1) A county must be interested in developing a multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan to include the incorporated and unincorporated communities, and tribal governments (if tribal governments are interested in participating); (2) A county must be willing to work in cooperation with ADEM, a state selected contractor and other planning participants in developing a multi-hazard mitigation plan; (3) A county must have commitment and significant interest in reducing damages from future natural and technological disasters; (4) A county must have a disaster history and potential for disasters; and (5) Significant growth in county population relative to the county. As a result, eight counties submitted an application. ADEM made the assumption that since a county submitted a grant application, the county met numbers 1-3 of the above criteria. Therefore, selection criteria four and five would be the primary focus of the selection panel.

The selection panel was assembled and made up of four people. They reviewed the applications submitted by eight counties, along with a package which included a disaster history matrix and county population data. Each panelist reviewed the information independently and prioritized the county from 1-8 with 1 being the best. The scores from each evaluation were added and the four counties with the lowest numbers were chosen. The counties were Pinal, Coconino, Graham and Yuma.

In 2004, ADEM again applied for a PDM planning grant and was awarded \$413,565. These funds were used to assist Apache, Cochise, Gila, Greenlee, LaPaz, Navajo, and Yavapai Counties. The same process listed above was again used to select and prioritize the counties.

Maricopa, Mohave and Pima Counties chose to apply for mitigation funds directly. All three have applied and been awarded funds through either HMGP or PDM to develop hazard mitigation plans. Technical assistance was provided to all three counties. The technical assistance has included providing them with a detailed scope of work, a copy of the Model Plan, and a Glossary of Terms (so that all communities in Arizona will be consistent with hazards names).

In 2006, a PDM grant of \$419,700 was awarded to assist tribal governments with the development of hazard mitigation plans.

As a result of this effort, hazard mitigation plans approved by FEMA as of September 2007 for the State are: all 15 counties, 79 of 90 local jurisdictions and 8 of 20 federally recognized Indian tribes with land/infrastructure. As a result of a project currently in progress, we anticipate six more Indian tribes will have developed plans no later than September 2008. Additionally, ADEM will soon begin a new project to develop hazard mitigation plans for the remaining local jurisdictions and Indian tribes. The above efforts were made possible by \$1,406,390 in PDM grants awarded to ADEM and match requirements met by the State in the amount of \$437,547 during the period of 2003 – Present (projects shown in "PDM Funded Projects, 2002-2007" table below. In addition, three counties were granted HMGP funds in 2002 for the development of their mitigation plans (shown in "HMGP Funded Projects, 2002-2007" table below).

In order to manage the planning projects and grants, ADEM hired a contractor to facilitate the planning process, perform research, create maps and assess vulnerability using HAZUS and various technical methods. The contractor works with the jurisdictions under the direction of the Planning Program Manager in the Mitigation Office. When possible, ADEM's Planning Program Manager attends planning meetings to assist, answer questions and monitor the performance of the



contractor. Since the State provides the matching funds, there is no obligation for the participating jurisdictions other than total commitment to the project.

As indicated in our original Plan, ADEM has provided planning support tools through the development and distribution of the Model Local Hazard Mitigation Plan and MitigationPlan.com. The intention of the Model Local Hazard Mitigation Plan is to assist local jurisdictions in their planning efforts in a step-by-step manner. Although the jurisdictions were guided through the process by the project contractor, this guide offers an explanation of the process, helpful examples and exact requirement language. It is ADEM's intent to develop a similar guide for the update process which will include lessons learned about the Plan updating process and any new DMA 2K requirements.

MitigationPlan.com, the web-based hazard mitigation planning program developed to facilitate the preparation of mitigation plans, has challenged us with issues regarding its capabilities. The primary objectives of the program were that it would provide:

- A web-based tool that would facilitate the preparation of hazard mitigation plans;
- An electronic repository at the State level for information provided in local mitigation plans;
- A system database used to access and query rolled-up local mitigation planning information for use in reviewing grant project proposals.

However, discovered since the original Plan; the program meets the first two objectives, however, falls short on the third. The details of "rolling up" local information into the State Plan are unclear. According to our findings, this function is not available in the program. Understanding the program and how information is input and stored, it is difficult to envision how "rolled-up" local information could be integrated into a state plan and produce a clear and useful document. This issue was reported to the developer by ADEM's SHMO last year, however, there have been no substantial changes to the program since that time. It was and still is our hope that the program will have functionality that will assist us in integrating local plan information into this Plan. Additionally, reporting in the program is limited to a choice of pre-determined or "canned" formats, leaving no option for the user to query specific information based on a set of criteria of their choice. This function would be particularly useful when reviewing projects for funding consideration and determining top ranking local hazards to assist in implementation of mitigation activities.

Nearly all local mitigation plans are already input into the program, though we are unsure of the level of use by the jurisdictions. We are also unsure of how the program will accommodate plan updates and the developer's commitment to making revisions according to new or changing DMA 2K requirements.

At this point, we are re-evaluating the program's usefulness to the State and beginning serious discussions with the developer regarding the issues above and their commitment to providing adequate solutions.

The pros of our implementation strategy include:

- ADEM applying for the grants on behalf of the local jurisdictions and tribal governments. Many jurisdictions do not have the resources to focus their attention to applying for grants;
- ADEM meeting the match requirements. Many jurisdictions do not have the financial resources to meet the 25% match requirement.
- Ensuring the counties included the communities within the county. By including the communities within the county, ADEM was able to assist more communities and get a "bigger bang for our buck."

The cons of our implementation strategy include:

- In the planning process for the first four counties, ADEM realized having meetings at the county-level was difficult for communities within the county because they did not have easy access to their data and it was difficult to provide one-on-one support. This problem was fixed for the next eight counties by having only the initial meeting at the county-level and meeting, thereafter, at each community.
- Having mitigation planning software was a great idea, but because of the limitations of the software, ADEM must review the pros and cons and come up with a different strategy, as stated above.

The Mitigation Office keeps track of approval dates of all mitigation plans within the state in a table which is located in a Mitigation common drive. This will assist anyone who comes into the mitigation office with the plan status statewide. Detailed documentation is also kept for each county, community and tribal government regarding e-mails and telephone conversations so anyone coming into the office can immediately know what has been happening.



HMGP FUNDED PROJECTS, 2002-2007				
Disaster	#	Year	Project	Location
Rodeo-Chedeski Fire	1422	2002	Mitigation Plan	Navajo County
Rodeo-Chedeski Fire	1422	2002	Mitigation Plan	Mohave County
Rodeo-Chedeski Fire	1422	2002	Mitigation Plan	Maricopa County
Summer 2006 Monsoons & Floods	1660	2006	In Progress	Various
Feb 2005 Winter Storm & Flood	1586	2005	Cottonwood Wash Barriers	Town of Pima
Feb 2005 Winter Storm & Flood	1586	2005	Mesquite Library	City of Phoenix
Feb 2005 Winter Storm & Flood	1586	2005	State Mitigation Plan Update	ADEM
Northern AZ Winter Storm	1581	2004	AZGS Post-Fire Debris Flow	Gila County
Northern AZ Winter Storm	1581	2004	Doodlebug Road	City of Sedona
Northern AZ Winter Storm	1581	2004	Flood Control Annex (to State Plan)	ADEM
Aspen Fire	1477	2003	Calle Azulejo Drainage Control	Santa Cruz
Aspen Fire	1477	2003	Sabino Canyon Main Line	Pima County
Note: Shaded items: matching funds were met by the State. Total for the two projects above \$23,825.				
Source: Mitigation Section, ADEM, 2007.				

PDM FUNDED PROJECTS, 2002-2007				
Project	Location	Year	Fed Share	Non-Fed Share
Cañada del Oro Acquisition	Pima County	2003	\$3,000,000.00	\$1,026,642.00
Pima County Mitigation Plan	Pima County	2004	\$93,750.00	\$31,250.00
			Fed Share	State Met Match
State Mitigation Plan Upgrade	ADEM	2007	\$137,250.00	\$ 45,750.00
Local Mitigation Planning	ADEM	2007	\$419,700.00	\$139,900.00
Tribal Mitigation Planning	Various	2005	\$231,000.00	\$77,000.00
Local Mitigation Planning	ADEM	2004	\$413,565.00	\$137,855.00
Local Mitigation Planning	Various	2003	\$248,375.00	\$82,792.00
State Plan/Model Plan/Online System	ADEM	2002	\$371,371.00	\$123,790.00
			<b>\$1,821,261.00</b>	<b>\$607,087.00</b>
Source: Mitigation Section, ADEM, 2007.				

### Local Non-Planning Funding & Technical Assistance

Since the approval of our original Plan, there have been three federally declared disasters in Arizona; #1581 declared 2/17/05, due to severe winter storms and flooding, #1586 declared 4/14/05, due to severe winter storms and flooding and #1660 declared 9/07/06, due to monsoon floods (see table above for project funding information).

To illustrate the funding and technical assistance procedures previously followed, below we have provided a description of Disaster 1660, declared 9/07/2006, Summer Monsoon Floods (supporting documents for below activity included in Appendix C of this Plan):

- Generated 38 Notices of Intent to File;
- Held five applicant briefings\*;
- Held two Benefit Cost Analysis (BCA) workshops\*\*;
- Reviewed 12 applications;
- Submitted four primary applications and two backup applications for consideration to FEMA.



\*Applicant briefing details:

- September 26, 2006 – Graham/Greenlee Counties: 16 attendees
- September 27, 2006 – Gila County: 6 attendees
- September 28, 2006 – Pima County: 14 attendees
- September 29, 2006 – Navajo County: 6 attendees
- October 3, 2006 – Pinal County: 13 attendees

BCA workshop details:

- October 25-26, 2006
- November 30-December 1, 2006

Assistance the State has and will continue to provide to local jurisdictions with HMGP projects.

Upon a federal disaster declaration; ADEM intends to:

- Contact jurisdictions and other potential applicants and solicit desired project summaries or "Notices of Intent" to submit an application;
- Visit specific counties affected by the disaster to observe and advise regarding possible mitigation projects;
- Conduct workshops will be conducted throughout the State to assist applicants in the preparation of their applications and the Benefit Cost Analysis process;
- Meet individually with potential applicants that are unable to attend the scheduled workshops to assist in application completion;
- Review, prioritize and submit applications;
- Maintain ongoing monitoring and contact with successful sub-grantees in the management of their projects and completion of required reports;
- When possible, coordinate project site visits to monitor progress and photograph the work as it is accomplished.